

CASE

November 19, 1975

POUCH MAIL

George J. Brandt, Jr., Esq.
Watson, Leavenworth, Kalton & Taggart
100 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10017

Re: Helf. 552-797 Great Britain PM 620

Dear George:

In response to the Official Action and our agents' letter, let me note the following in regard to specific paragraphs:

1. etc. The claims may be replaced by those found in the Nigerian application to meet the formal objections.

3. The specific Example 3 maximum of 360 °C is obviously within the broader limits of the maximum 370 °C stated by the Claim. As for the pressures, those stated in Example 1 represent the operating pressures, wherein only 700 psig is a maximum, well within the range of both p. 21 and Claim 3 limits. The discrepancy between p. 21 and Claim 3 is not understood; the lower pressure of the operable range should be about 463 psia, or 468 psig. Probably 563 should have read 483. The upper limit should be 900 psig.

7. In Figure 1, line 16 leads to a source of liquid carbon dioxide, 18 is a port to the atmosphere (or to an equivalent unpressured chamber), 20 is a line to a source of gaseous carbon dioxide under pressure, and 22 is a line to a liquid carbon dioxide recovery vessel or the like. Each line of course is valved.

8 and 9. Handle as you wish.

I hope this provides enough for your response. Please call me if more is needed.

Very truly yours,

G. Esler Inskip
Assistant Patent Officer

ceh cc: R. Thomson

2028583339